

From: []@xs4all.nl
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2002 2:21 PM
To: []; bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com; []
Cc: []
Subject: Re: BPDG: Comments of Philips, Thomson and Zenith on the Draft Co-Chairs Report

All,

The VOSN supports the objections brought forth by Philips, Thomson and Zenith, though our objections are not limited to them. Other objections we have are defined in the EFF documents.

Regards,

[]
Spokesman Copyright
Vereniging Open Source Nederland (VOSN)

From: []@sharplabs.com
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2002 12:42 PM
To: 'bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com'
Subject: RE: BPDG: Comments of Philips, Thomson and Zenith on the Draft Co -Chairs Report

As has been noted before, Sharp Laboratories of America is generally in agreement with the comments [of Philips, Zenith and Thomson].

In particular, we are generally in agreement with the 'General Comments' section - the comments with respect to consensus, level of agreement, process and the fait accompli 'proposals'.

Regards,

[]
Manager, Standards
Sharp Laboratories of America
8605 Westwood Center Drive, Suite 206
Vienna, VA 22182

From: []@krausmail.com
Sent: Thursday, May 30, 2002 3:04 PM
To: []; bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com; []
Subject: Re: BPDG: Comments of Philips, Thomson and Zenith on the Draft Co-Chairs Report

DigitalConsumer.org would like to sign on to the comments to the co-chairs' final report made by Philips, Thomson and Zenith. Thank you.

=====

[]
Co-Founder DigitalConsumer.org
[]@digitalconsumer.org

From: []@eff.org
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 9:25 AM
To: bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com
Subject: Re: BPDG: Comments of Philips, Thomson and Zenith on the Draft Co-Chairs Report

[]@eff.org

The Electronic Frontier Foundation finds the comments of Philips, Thomson, and Zenith to be well-taken. We especially support the observation that the draft co-chairs' report tends to minimize the nature and extent of substantive disagreements within BPDG. We encourage participants and anyone else interested in BPDG's work to consider these comments carefully.

We especially concur with the observation that BPDG's discussions and the proposed co-chairs' recommendations "raise fundamental issues of public policy, including issues relating to competition and fair use rights, among others". This is particularly relevant in light of recent allegations that some parties might seek to use the BPDG's recommendations as a basis for legislation requiring certain products to conform to the Compliance and Robustness Rules.

--

[]

Staff Technologist
Electronic Frontier Foundation

[]@eff.org
<http://www.eff.org/>

From: []@microsoft.com
Sent: Friday, May 31, 2002 6:12 AM
To: bpdg-tech@list.lmicp.com
Subject: BPDG: Additional feedback on co-chairs report

On behalf of Microsoft, we share many of the views expressed by Philips and others about the inherent flaws in the BPDG process. We do not doubt the good faith intentions of those leading the effort, but the process and procedures of the BPDG have unmistakably caused damage to the credibility of the organization and cast doubt over the integrity of the results. To claim that the result of this process reflects "substantial agreement" or anything resembling a consensus is simply to turn a deaf ear to the points raised by numerous parties. It is noteworthy that so many people invested a great deal of time, energy and good faith in these proceedings. Yet after all that effort, the list of issues not resolved and punted to the parallel group is almost as long, and certainly as substantial, as the issues purportedly addressed. We encourage all participants to continue the dialog and hope that the progress achieved by bringing together diverse perspectives and generating a broader understanding of the needs of all the stakeholders participating will be sustained in a more constructive and effective forum.